



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/680,522	10/07/2003	Ravi Kuchibhotla	CS23738RL	5055	
20280	7590	07/07/2008	EXAMINER		
MOTOROLA INC		GARY, ERIKA A			
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER	
W4 - 39Q		2617			
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343					
		NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
		07/07/2008		ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM
ADB035@Motorola.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/680,522	KUCHIBHOTLA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Erika A. Gary	2617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Erika A. Gary/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 14-16, 25, and 34-36, the Examiner maintains that Mildh discloses the claimed limitations. Applicant argues that Mildh does not teach pointer information indicating where the communication device may obtain information about core networks. However, Mildh teaches this limitation in the disclosure of the SI and/or PSI message telling the mobile station which core network it should camp on. Applicant also argues that Mildh does not teach receiving preferred core network information from a communication device. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and contends that this is taught in paragraphs 0035-0039. Regarding the claims 14-16, 25, 27-28, 30, and 32-33, the Examiner maintains that Costa teaches the claimed limitations. Applicant argues that Costa does not teach pointer information indicating where the communication device may obtain information about multiple core networks. However, Costa teaches this limitation in the disclosure of a core network identifier field that distinguishes between two different core networks [col. 2: lines 13-27; col. 4: lines 43-51 ; col. 5: line 56 - col. 6: line 5]. Costa also teaches that if two core networks are accessible from the location area, an appropriate range of values are provided by the core network identifier [col. 6: lines 37-39]. Hence Costa also teaches obtaining information about multiple core networks, as contended by the Applicant. Applicant also argues that Costa does not teach selecting a core network. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees as the purpose of Costa's invention is "core network allocation". Regarding claims 25 and 26, the Examiner maintains that Haumont teaches the claimed limitations. Applicant argues that Haumont does not teach a communication device that receives information including at least one of identities of at least some of the multiple core networks sharing the common access network, core network domain information, information on services supported by at least some of the multiple core networks sharing the common access network. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees, and maintains that Haumont teaches this limitation as only one set of information is required as the claim language states "at least one of" [paragraphs 0006, 0018, 0038, 0041, 0043]. Further, it is inherent that the communication device subsequently selects a core network.